UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,482	07/20/2001	Philip Andrew Flocken	10007452-1	2576

7590 11/21/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
ZHONG, CHAD	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/909,482	FLOCKEN, PHILIP ANDREW	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chad Zhong	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 July 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

3. Applicant is required to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification. The status of all citations of US filed applications in the specification should also be updated where appropriate.

4. The specification is objected to because of the following:
current US patent policy does not permit the use of hyperlinks in the specification. Such links are directed to an Internet site, the contents of which are subject to change without notice. Therefore, the potential for inclusion of new matter would be a constant problem. See page 5, for example. Correction is required throughout the entire document.

5. The examiner interpret claim 1 as follows: The server scans client side data, the data was placed on the client by the server at a prior time. Potential erroneous data are scanned and recognized, as a response from server to client, server sends commands to clients to neutralize/delete the erroneous data from the client.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. Claims 1-5, and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jasen et al. (hereinafter Jasen), US 2002/0019879.

7. As per claim 1, Jasen teaches a server-based, computer implemented method for detecting and eliminating invalid server-supplied data from client machines comprising the following steps performed following the receipt of a request for services from a client web browser which request is accompanied by server data placed on the client web machine via commands for the web browser included in transport protocol response headers sent by the server or by related servers on earlier occasions (Jasen, [0018]; [0021-0022]; [0032-0033], suggest the concept of removing data if data found invalid):

scanning the server data which is received from the client web browser to identify invalid data (Jasen, [0032-0033], server validates coupon serial numbers that are embedded in messages during a session with the client, session initiated by client or the server);

determining an identifier that accompanies any data which is invalid (Jasen, [0033], coupon serial numbers are no longer valid); and

as part of a server response sent to the client web browser, including in the response a command or commands that causes only the invalid data, identified by the identifier, to be neutralized (Jasen, [0033], server instruct the client to delete the coupons).

8. As per claim 2, Jasen teaches detection and neutralization of one or more cookies (Jasen, [0033]; [0059], cookie information are part of the coupon, deletion of coupon means deletion of cookie information as well) supplied by the server or related servers to client web browsers and, when its data

and name is later returned by a particular client web browser to the server, is found to contain invalid data, and wherein only cookies containing invalid data, identified by name, are neutralized (Jasen, [0033], wherein the cookies are associated with the coupons, when coupon is modified/ 'neutralized', the corresponding cookie information is modified/ 'neutralized' as well).

9. As per claim 3, Jasen teaches the server data accompanying a request for services received from a client web browser contains one or more separate sets of data each including a name (Jasen, [0059], wherein the name is the domain name or IP address) and a data value (Jasen, [0059], wherein the data value is the cookie information), and wherein the command or commands sent to the client as part of a response to the client includes one or more commands each of which identifies by name a set of data that contains invalid data and that is to be neutralized, whereby other sets of data containing valid data are not neutralized (Jasen, [0033], [0024], wherein the invalid coupons are neutralized, and valid ones are kept the same).

10. As per claim 4, Jasen teaches neutralization is carried out by sending to a client a command that places on the client a new data set associated with a name for a data set containing invalid data and a domain identifier of the server or of the related servers, the new data set containing no erroneous data, whereby the new data set displaces the erroneous data set and thereby neutralizes the erroneous data set (Jasen, [0033], wherein the updated coupons are sent to the clients to update the expired or invalid ones; [0059]).

11. As per claim 5, Jasen teaches server data placed on a client machine via commands sent to a client web browser includes an expiration date, and wherein neutralization is accomplished by adjusting the expiration date to a valve that neutralizes the invalid data through expiration (Jasen, [0055]; [0086], coupons expire upon certain date/time stamp).

12. As per claim 12, Jasen teaches a computer program containing instructions enabling it to cause a server to carry out the method steps as in claim 1 (Jasen, see for example, [0094], system implemented in software).

13. As per claims 13-17, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 1-5 above respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 6-11, 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasen, in view of "Fundamentals of Java Servlets: The Java Servlet API", MageLang Institute (hereinafter Mage), Jan 1999.

16. As per claim 6, Jasen disclose the invention substantially as rejected in claim 5 above, but does not teach the expiration date is set to zero.

However, Mage teaches the expiration date is set to zero (pg 22, "using cookies", paragraph 1-5, for advantages of detailed cookie manipulation).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mage with Jasen because the combination would improve the capability and efficiency for Jasen's system by providing detailed analysis of set cookie command, one such

command being deleting cookies, by providing limited time for the life of a cookie, Mage allows re-utilization of resources on Jansen's system.

17. As per claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 6 above.

18. As per claim 8, Jasen disclose the invention substantially as rejected in claim 1 above, but does not teach the invalid data comprises data whose value corresponds to one or more printable character identification codes which match codes contained in a list of invalid character codes.

However, Mage teaches the invalid data comprises data whose value corresponds to one or more printable character identification codes which match codes contained in a list of invalid character codes (see for example, pg 6, pg 9, wherein the values can easily be printed out using print commands in Java, furthermore, the error exception of throw and catch eliminates potential invalid data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Jasen and Mage because the combination would improve the error analysis for Jasen's system by providing detailed solution to catch and display of the invalid data.

19. As per claim 9, Jasen disclose the invention substantially as rejected in claim 1 above, including the data transfer protocol is HTTP or an equivalent protocol (Jansen, [0022]; [0027]). But, Jasen does not explicitly teach the data received comprises one or more data sets preceded by a "Cookie:" command or its equivalent, and separated by semi-colons or some other equivalent separator and of the form "NAME=VALUE" or some equivalent form, and wherein the neutralization of such data is achieved by returning one or more commands "Set-cookie:" or its equivalent, each including at least a first expression followed by one or more expressions, separated by semi-colons or some equivalent separator, of the form "NAME=VALUE" or its equivalent where NAME is the name associated with invalid data and VALUE is valid data which may be no data.

However, Mage teaches the data received comprises one or more data sets preceded by a

"Cookie:" command or its equivalent, and separated by semi-colons or some other equivalent separator and of the form "NAME=VALUE" or some equivalent form, and wherein the neutralization of such data is achieved by returning one or more commands "Set-cookie:" or its equivalent, each including at least a first expression followed by one or more expressions, separated by semi-colons or some equivalent separator, of the form "NAME=VALUE" or its equivalent where NAME is the name associated with invalid data and VALUE is valid data which may be no data (see for example, pg 22, "using cookies", paragraph 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching Mage with Jasen because the combination would improve the functionality for Jasen's system by providing detailed analysis of set cookie command, furthermore, it would improve the error analysis for Jasen's system by providing detailed solution to catch and display of the invalid data.

20. As per claim 10, Jasen – Mage disclose the invention substantially as rejected in claim 9 above, including in which the command "Set-cookie:" or its equivalent is also followed by an expression "domain=DOMAIN_NAME" or its equivalent where DOMAIN_NAME identifies the server or group of related servers (Jasen, [0059]).

21. As per claim 11, Jasen – Mage disclose the invention substantially as rejected in claim 9 above, including in which the command "Set-cookie:" or its equivalent is also followed by an expression "expires=DATE" or its equivalent where DATE is a date or its equivalent adjusted to neutralize the invalid data values by the client web browser (Jasen, [0055], dissolution of coupons involve setting the time limit on the coupons).

22. As per claims 18-23, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 6-11

above respectively.

23. As per claim 24, claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 11 above.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "SERVER SIDE FILTER FOR CORRUPT WEB BROWSER COOKIES".

i. US 2002/0046286 Caldwell et al.

ii. Holding state with the ParameterPropagatingSSI", 1997

iii. "Java How-to, Javascript interaction", March, 2001

iv. "Public Key cryptography for Network Time Protocol Version 1", Mills, June 2000

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAROENCHONWANIT, BUNJOB can be reached on (571)272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

CZ
November 8, 2005